



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

Writ Petition No.7464/2025

Vikram and others V State of Maharashtra and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. S.R. Sayare, Advocate h/f S.W. Deshpande, Advocate for petitioners.
Ms Sapkal, AGP, Advocate for respondent nos.1 and 2.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATE : 01-12-2025.

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners.

2. By this petition, the petitioners have challenged order dated 31-08-2001 passed by the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Aurangabad Camp at Nagpur, by which the revision application filed by the petitioners herein was dismissed and order dated 31-07-1999 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer Jalgaon Jamod was confirmed. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that after getting knowledge about the impugned order, the petitioners have raised challenged to the said order by the instant petition. The petition is filed after about 24 years from the impugned order.

3. As regards the issue of delay and laches, learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the reasons are mentioned in paragraph 10 and 11 of the petition, which are reproduced below :-

“10. That, the petitioners were not aware about the said order as it was never communicated to them. The petitioners are in continuous cultivating possession even after the order was passed as no interruption was created to the cultivating possession of the petitioners.

11. It is submitted that, the respondent no.1 is likely to bring solar substation under the Mukhyamantri Saur Krushi Vahini Yojana, on the cultivating field of the

petitioners and resolution of the same is passed by the Gram Panchayat. The petitioners sought the information about the said resolution in the Gram Panchayat, however, the Gram Panchayat had not provided any information regarding the same to the petitioners. The petitioners are under threat of dispossession from the field which is in their cultivating possession.”

4. Having regard to the fact that the petitioners were the original applicants before the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal whose revision application was dismissed by the impugned judgment and award, it is incomprehensible that the petitioners were not aware about the decision of the Tribunal. The petitioners were not diligent at all.
5. The reasons mentioned for delay are not at all sufficient. On perusal of the record it is clear, that the petition suffers from delay and laches and need not be entertained on this count alone.
6. Writ petitions is accordingly dismissed.

(Prafulla S. Khubalkar, J.)